

1967

Users and usefulness of Midwest Plan Service publications

David Neil Gustafson
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#), [Bioresource and Agricultural Engineering Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gustafson, David Neil, "Users and usefulness of Midwest Plan Service publications" (1967). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 16339.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/16339>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

USERS AND USEFULNESS OF MIDWEST
PLAN SERVICE PUBLICATIONS

by

David Neil Gustafson

A Thesis Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major Subject: Industrial Education

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Iowa State University
Of Science and Technology
Ames, Iowa

1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
METHOD OF PROCEDURE	14
FINDINGS	20
DISCUSSION	39
SUMMARY	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
APPENDIX A. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE PUBLICATIONS	52
APPENDIX B. OTHER OCCUPATIONS LISTED	56
APPENDIX C. CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRES	59

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is about the educational publication agency, Midwest Plan Service. The presentation will describe a problem of plan services, a method to analyze the problem, the findings of a survey, and some conclusions of the author.

What is the Midwest Plan Service?

The Midwest Plan Service is an official activity of thirteen Land Grant Universities and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It operates under a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Directors of the Cooperative Extension Services and Agriculture Experiment Stations of the cooperating states. The thirteen cooperating universities are: University of Alaska; University of Illinois; University of Minnesota; Purdue University; Iowa State University; Kansas State University; Michigan State University; University of Missouri; University of Nebraska; North Dakota State University; The Ohio State University; South Dakota State University; and University of Wisconsin.

Objective of the Midwest Plan Service

The primary objective of the Midwest Plan Service is to provide the best possible plans and management information for farm buildings. This information is used by the cooperating agricultural extension staffs, the extension staffs of other universities, and by individual users who learn about the available publications.

The Midwest Plan Service acts as the agency for coordinating and pooling the best the cooperating states have to offer in the way of talents, experiences, research findings, and individual specialties. It at times seeks the help of expe-

rienced experts who are not on the staffs of the cooperating universities. From this coordination and cooperation, all states and individual users receive the best material and information available at that time.

History of Midwest Plan Service

The Midwest Plan Service began in Fargo, North Dakota, in 1929, when a group of agricultural engineers from six North Central states discussed the question of cooperation and coordination of effort between their respective states. The question was raised by Professor Henry Giese of Iowa State College. These engineers felt the need for cooperative effort in the preparation of farm building plans for their states.

Due to insufficient funding support, no tangible progress was made for several years. In 1931, President Hughes of Iowa State College made a loan of \$6,000 to the service to begin operations. Kirk Fox, editor of "Successful Farming", assisted by publishing catalogs and materials lists and by supporting the travel of Professor Giese who contacted potential cooperators and users of the service.

The first edition of Midwest Plans was published in 1933, with 115 plans offered. In 1937, 122 plans were listed after thorough revision. Each state made prints for distribution from vandykes which were supplied by the USDA for the first edition, and subsequently by the Midwest Plan Service.

In 1947 and 1948, the Directors of the Experiment Stations and Extension Services of the North Central Region developed, and approved the first Memorandum of Understanding. For the first time, the Midwest Plan Service became an official agency with formally defined duties, responsibilities, and privileges.

The Midwest Plan Service established its headquarters at Iowa State College soon after the first Memorandum of Understanding was signed. It was governed by the rules and regulations of that College.

The Plan Service has increased the number and type of publications offered, and now provides books on livestock equipment and management, plans for livestock and utility buildings, and data digests on many areas of interest to people in agriculture and industry.

The Role of Plan Service Publications

The Extension Agricultural Engineers of the cooperating universities are the biggest users of Midwest Plan Service publications. The extension engineers, in turn, distribute the publications to farmers, homeowners, and industrial people as part of their extension educational programs. The Midwest Plan Service, therefore, has an important part in the educational programs of the Agricultural Extension Service.

Philosophy of extension education

Extension education (18) is organized to reach people where they are - at home, work and play. It is the function of extension to teach people how to assess their own needs and how to solve their own problems, to help them acquire knowledge and understanding, and to inspire them to action. Extension personnel and materials must teach people how to think, not what to think.

The goal of extension is to teach not only desirable practices and understandings, but also the interdependence of practices and understandings so fundamental to achieving satisfying family and community life.

It is extension's role to inspire people as individuals, families and communities to work together to identify their own problems; second, to help them determine their objectives; and third, to counsel and supply technical help to them as needed in working toward these objectives.

The Vermont study (11) points out that extension education is based on the needs of the people it serves. These needs are of two types; felt needs for which people are seeking solutions, and needs that are not recognized by the majority of people.

These needs govern the subject matter taught, and they should govern the teaching methods used. For instance, extension educational programs that meet the second need should be directed to creating awareness and interest in doing something about these needs.

Publications are not an end in themselves, but rather a means to an end. Thus, their effectiveness as a teaching method can best be measured in terms of how well they help achieve extension's educational objectives.

Using this criterion, the Vermont study (11) expresses the question of effectiveness in two parts:

1. Are the right publications provided?
2. How well are the provided publications read and used?

The objectives of this study were to obtain knowledge and understanding about the users of Midwest Plan Service publications, and to determine how the publications were used.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

If a message has promised great reward and does not live up to the expectations, the desired effect may be lost (16). In addition, it has been shown that readers base their expectations of reward on previous experiences. A source that does not fulfill expectations has the danger of causing a reader to lose interest in other messages from that source.

Schramm (13) describes the conditions of success in communication as:

1. The message must be so designed and delivered as to gain the user's attention.
2. The message must employ signs which refer to experience common to source and user, so as to "get the meaning across".
3. The message must arouse personality needs in the user and suggest ways to meet those needs.
4. The message must suggest an appropriate way to meet those needs. The user's status and associates will play a part in his use of the message.

Schramm (13, pp. 13-16) continues: "You can see, by looking at these requirements, why the expert communicator usually begins by finding out as much as he can about his intended user, and why "know your audience" is the first rule of practical mass communication.

"In general, communication must be built on what already exists. If we take advantage of the existing pattern of understanding, drives, and attitudes to gain acceptance for our message, then we may hope to divert the pattern slightly in the direction we want to move it."

Communication Research

Communication research is concerned with how to be effective in communication, how to be understood, how to be clear, how people use mass media, how society can use the mass media to its greatest good, and, in general, how the basic process of communication works.

Many studies have found that people have strong existing and influencing patterns of understanding, drives and attitudes. Some of the findings of those deeply involved in communications research are described below.

Klapper (3, pp. 67-70) says, "Communications research has consistently revealed that people tend in the main to read, watch, or listen to communications which present points of view with which they are themselves in sympathy and tend to avoid communications of a different hue.

"The influence of mass communication is mediated by such factors as pre-dispositions, selective processes, group memberships, and the like. These factors usually render mass communication as an agent of reinforcement, but these same factors may under some conditions make mass communication an agent of change."

Change is more likely to occur when a person is predisposed to change. He may be tired of his present system, or he may be wondering what changes may be good for him. When in this attitude of possible change, he requests a publication and is often able to be changed if the material presented is applicable to solving his dissatisfaction.

Waples, Berelson and Bradshaw (19, p. 57) say, "A reader's total background of training and experience determines what meanings he will assign to particular words and passages. His previous knowledge and his previous attitudes influence his whole understanding of and response to the publication. How much

of it he credits, what he accepts and rejects, the criticisms and the applications he makes - in short, his various responses to the publication are determined by the kind of person the reader is, i.e., by the nature of his predispositions."

"Practically speaking", says Schramm (14, p. 111), "the following are some of the workings of perception a communicator must expect, and, so far as possible, allow for, as he tries to communicate his meaning."

1. The receiver will interpret the message in terms of his experience and the ways he has learned to respond to it.
2. The receiver will interpret the message in such a way as to resist any change in strong personality structures.
3. The receiver will tend to group characteristics in experience so as to make whole patterns".

As Hyman and Sheatsley (2, p. 413) state, "The physical barriers to communication merely impede the supply of information. In order to increase public knowledge, not only is it necessary to present more information, but it is essential that the mass audience be exposed to and that it absorb the information. And in order to insure such exposure and absorption the psychological characteristics of human beings must be taken into account."

Changing Attitudes Through Communication

Listed below is a brief summary of the conclusions about attitude change through mass communication to which the research evidence seems to point (15, pp. 209-211).

1. Attitudes can be changed by mass communication.
2. To accomplish attitude change, a suggestion for change must first be received and accepted.

3. The suggestion will more likely be accepted if it meets existing personality needs and drives. Persons tend to respond in the direction of reducing drives.

4. The suggestion will more likely be accepted if it is in harmony with valued group norms and loyalties. Group relationships are important to individual attitude change.

5. The suggestion is more likely to be accepted if the source is perceived as trustworthy or expert.

6. The suggestion is more likely to be accepted if the message follows certain rules of "rhetoric" for attitude-changing communication.

- a. There is often an advantage in stating the desired conclusion specifically and positively. Letting the facts speak for themselves is usually not enough, and it is not safe to let the audience draw the conclusion for itself, except in the case of a highly intelligent audience. A concept is more likely to be learned when stated positively than negatively.
- b. Sometimes it is better to state both sides of an issue; other times, to state only one side. One can almost always accomplish more immediate attitude change with a one-sided presentation, but if one expects the audience to later hear competing arguments, then he will be wise to use a two-sided presentation.
- c. Repeat with variation. More examples make for more learning.
- d. Use simplifying labels and slogans where appropriate. More intelligent audiences may be repelled by slogan repetition and similar devices.
- e. Make use of audience participation where possible. Types of participation that may affect attitudes include: paying for it, risking something for it,

something to do about it, write a letter, join a club, and playing a role.

- f. Organize the message to take advantage of primacy and recency. Where the audience is familiar with the subject, and deep concern is felt over it, there seems to be reason for leading up to the main point at the end. If the audience is unfamiliar with the subject, or uninterested, there may be good reason to introduce the main point first.

Lionberger (6) lists the following stages for the adoption process for farmers:

1. Awareness - the first knowledge about a new idea, product or practice.

Newspapers, magazines, radio and TV are the most frequent sources at this stage. Late adopters usually become aware by observing other farmers.

2. Interest - the active seeking of extensive and detailed information about the idea to determine its possible usefulness and applicability. The mass media, other people, and some agricultural agencies are the most frequent sources at this stage.

3. Evaluation - weighing and sifting the acquired information and evidence in the light of the existing conditions into which the practice would have to fit. The most useful source at this stage is other well-regarded farmers.

4. Trial - the tentative trying out of the practice or idea, accompanied by acquisition of information on how to do it. Other farmers are usually the most important source of this information, but salesmen, dealers, and some specialists are also used.

5. Adoption - the full-scale integration of the practice into the on-going operation. Final adoption is not always permanent adoption. The adoption must usually result in self satisfaction and the satisfaction of others.

Lazarsfeld and Menzel (5) express the process of attitude change as a decision

process. In a first phase, the farmer becomes aware of an innovation, usually from a farm magazine. In a second phase, his interest is aroused; in a third phase, he reaches the decision to accept the new practice; these two phases are usually brought about during discussions with neighbors. The final phase is the trying of the practice with the help of printed material that contains directions and guidance.

Findings and Recommendations from Various Studies

The Vermont study (11) found that 36 percent of the people surveyed did not know they could obtain publications. This indicated a large potential audience and a need for better methods of acquainting people with existing extension publications.

The study also found that of the people who read one of the publications sent them, 63 percent found what they were looking for, 20 percent found part of the desired information, 10 percent did not find the desired information, and 7 percent didn't know or didn't answer the question. Also found was that the longer the publication, the less likely it will be read, and visa versa.

Recommendations from the Vermont study included:

1. Publications should provide answers to recognized needs of the readers. This means first determining their recognized needs and then providing information to meet them. This does not mean that unrecognized needs should not be dealt with in publications, but that information on unrecognized needs should supplement rather than replace information on recognized needs. Providing people with information for recognized needs develops confidence in the information source. This is basic to developing awareness and interest in unrecognized needs.

2. Publications are more effective if used as an aid in a planned educational program in which awareness and interest are created in unrecognized needs.

3. A mail survey is a practical method of "taking a reading" of readership and use of publications.

Some studies have attempted to find if the paying for publications, or in some other way expending an effort, has an effect on readership and acceptance.

Berkland (1) could find no relationship. The Vermont study (11) found that the people were willing to pay for a publication, but did not show that readership or acceptance was improved.

Lassahn (4) found that farmers who tended to accept timely, personal, and low-value items or stories were those who had the highest income, received the median number of publications, and were middle-aged farmers. She also found that another group of farmers tended to reject information about people's successes, to accept information with economic possibilities, and consistently rejected safety items. These farmers had a median income, received the most publications and were the youngest.

Lionberger (7) found that 30 percent of his sample obtained farm information from the county agent, 33 percent obtained information from other institutional sources, and the rest did not use these sources. This last group of farmers were much older, had small farms, had a lower status in the community, and were far less competent technologically. Friends and neighbors seemed to be the most universally used source of farm information for these farmers.

Lionberger (6) suggests: "What's good for the big farmer may not be good for the small one. The small farmer, rather than follow the lead of the big farmer as he sometimes seems to do, might better develop plans and procedures specifically suited

to his smaller operation. By the same token, it might be well for the educator to do much the same thing in developing recommendations for improved farming practices."

Summary of Literature Review

Publication communications must be designed to answer the needs, both recognized and unrecognized, of the user. The individual user will interpret and accept an idea or concept in light of his past experience, his feelings about the source, and his recognized needs.

All publication agencies should present their material in a format that will be easily read and accepted by the users of specific publications. The agencies should publicize their offerings by using the acknowledged sources of information for a specific audience.

The recommendations contained in a publication should be specifically outlined as for whom it is most useful. There should be publications for all segments of the agency's possible audience.

Objectives of This Study

The objectives of this study were to obtain knowledge and understanding about the users of Midwest Plan Service publications, and to determine how the requested publications were used. The specific knowledge and understanding desired was:

1. To determine the occupation of the users.
2. To determine the types and sizes of the user's farming enterprises.
3. To determine the reasons users wanted the publications.
4. To determine if the publications contained the desired information.
5. To determine how the publications were used.
6. To determine where the user learned about his publication.
7. To elicit the user's suggestions for new publications.
8. To elicit the user's judgment on the usefulness of specific sections in his publication.

Assumptions

The investigation was designed assuming the following:

1. The selected sample is representative of potential users.
2. The publications selected for study are representative.
3. The individual user's reasons, thoughts, and desires are the items worthy of study.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Selecting the Sample

The Midwest Plan Service had the following publications available for distribution during the fiscal year 1965-1966.

<u>Publication</u>	<u>Number available</u>
Plans for farm service buildings	102
Livestock equipment books	9
Agricultural data digests	7

People from the United States, Canada, and many other countries ordered one or more publications from the Midwest Plan Service headquarters. Each cooperating state ordered publications for distribution to the people in their respective states. A total of 8,400 plans, 29,000 books, and 41,800 digests was ordered from the Midwest Plan Service headquarters during fiscal 1965-1966.

Table 1. Summary of 1965-1966 Midwest Plan Service publication orders

Publication	Total Number	Sales to States	Sales to individuals	
			3 or more	1 or 2
Plans	8,400	6,850	1,550	458
All books	29,005	25,295	- ^a	- ^a
Beef book	3,473	2,750	581	142
Swine book	5,753	5,112	552	89
Data digests	41,816	41,585	- ^a	- ^a

^aCould not obtain a complete summary from records.

The information contained in Midwest Plan Service publications is continually being revised and up-dated. Of those publications available for distribution during fiscal 1965-1966, a limited number contained the latest information and style of presentation.

The users who requested these up-to-date and most recent publications were selected as the sample for study. A small group of users of older plans was also included in the sample. This small group had requested plans that were not scheduled for revision or were in an acceptable format.

Another group of users were those who had ordered individual copies of the selected publications from the Iowa Extension Agricultural Engineers at Iowa State University. These users were handled as a separate sample, and were included as a means of obtaining knowledge and understanding related to one cooperating state's users.

Table 2. Summary of the samples and the selected publications.

Publication	Number in sample from Plan Service distribution	Number in sample from Iowa distribution
BOOKS		
Beef Equipment Plans	142	24
Swine Equipment Plans	89	19
PLANS		
Number 72676 ^a	160	11
Number 72425 ^b	107	11
Number 72426 ^b	59	17
Number 72754 ^c	21	-
Number 72675 ^a	25	-
Number 72678 ^a	15	-
Other plans ^d	71	-
Total	689	82

^aThese plans are for swine facilities.

^bThese plans are for beef facilities.

^cThis plan is for a poultry facility.

^dThese plans contain some livestock facilities, but the majority are for other farm-service buildings.

Preparing the Questionnaire

Of the many possible ways of obtaining information, a questionnaire was selected as the most appropriate for this study. The reasons for selecting the questionnaire method were as follows:

1. The amount of information desired could and would fit a short questionnaire.
2. The type of information sought could be obtained with the impersonal nature of a questionnaire.
3. The questionnaire method could economically reach many users, thereby increasing the sample size.
4. The questionnaire method was a quick and relatively inexpensive method of obtaining the desired information.

The questions were worded to obtain information that would fulfill the objectives of the study.

A first draft of the questionnaire was sent to ten randomly selected users from the Plan Service sample. Four of these users responded. The first draft was also presented to the investigator's graduate committee and several other interested persons for criticisms and suggestions.

A new questionnaire was prepared after studying the users' responses for questions that seemed to be misunderstood or were not answered. Many of the suggestions of the graduate committee were also included in the new questionnaire.

The questionnaires were printed by the offset printing method. The questions were printed in black ink on both sides of an 8½ by 11 inch, 20 pound bond paper. Samples of the questionnaires are in Appendix C.

The questionnaire sent to users of books and plans was identical except for

question nine, which requested the user's judgment on the usefulness of various sections within the type of publication he had received. The sections to be rated had to be different as they are not identical within each type of publication.

Sending the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were sent to the users by first class mail. Enclosed was a letter which contained an explanation of the purpose of the questionnaire and a request to return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible. Also included was an addressed, stamped envelop to be used for returning the questionnaire.

Three weeks after the questionnaires were sent, a post card reminder was sent to those who had not responded. The message on the card stressed the contribution that the user could make for himself and other users. A copy of the letter and post card reminder is in Appendix C.

Analysis of Returned Questionnaires

The possible answers from a questionnaire were coded so that all answers could be placed on IBM cards. All returned questionnaires had their coded answers placed on cards. The information concerning one user and his answers required three IBM cards.

A program was developed by the investigator that would tabulate all the answers of all responders. The program was designed to run on an IBM 360 computer. The data was analyzed in this manner for the following reasons:

1. It is a quick method.
2. It allows great flexibility in searching for a new picture or bit of information when it is wanted or thought of.

3. It allows the future use of the same data.
4. It forces the programmer to think out, in detail, the type and format of the information desired.

Some of the answers on the returned questionnaires did not lend themselves to treatment and analysis by computer. These included the answers to questions 10 and 11 which asked for suggestions for new publications, suggestions for revision, and any additional comments, criticisms, or suggestions a user had. These answers and suggestions were recorded and tabulated by the investigator and are shown in Appendix A.

Summary of the Samples and the Response of the Samples

The number of questionnaires sent and the number of questionnaires returned is shown in Tables 3 and 4. The findings described in the presentation are based on only those questionnaires that were returned and usable.

Table 3. Number and percentage of questionnaires sent and received from the Iowa Agricultural Engineering Extension sample

Publication	Number sent	Number returned	Percent returned
Beef book	24	14	58.4
Swine book	19	12	63.2
Plan 72676 ^a	11	8	72.7
Plan 72425 ^b	11	8	72.7
Plan 72426 ^b	17	8	47.0
Total	82	50	61.0

^aThis plan is for a swine facility.

^bThese plans are for beef facilities.

Table 4. Number and percentage of questionnaires sent and received from the Midwest Plan Service Headquarters sample

Publication	Number sent	Number returned		Percent returned
		Usable	Not usable ^a	
Beef book	142	84	2	60.6
Swine book	89	54	1	61.8
Plan 72676 ^c	160	69	2	44.4
Plan 72425 ^d	107	50	5	51.4
Plan 72426 ^d	59	28	2	50.9
Plan 72754 ^e	21	8	-	38.0
Plan 72675 ^c	25	13	4	68.0
Plan 72678 ^c	15	12	2	93.4
Other plans ^f	71	38	4	59.2
Total	689	356	22	55.0 ^b

^aThose who responded with information other than answers to the questionnaire. Among these responses were those who had moved and could not be reached, and those who did not want to answer or felt unqualified to answer.

^bThe total number of people sent questionnaires was 618, and the number responding was 332, or 53.7 percent.

^cThese plans are for swine facilities.

^dThese plans are for beef facilities.

^eThis plan is for a poultry facility.

^fThese plans are primarily for farm service buildings.

FINDINGS

Occupation of Users

Fifty percent of those ordering publications from the Midwest Plan Service Headquarters are farmers, and 70 percent of those ordering from Iowa Agricultural Engineering Extension are farmers. Approximately nine percent of both samples are part-time farmers and seven percent are county agents.

Many of the people who did not list an occupation are probably farmers. The answers many of these people gave to questions two and three, which asked about the user's connection with agriculture and the size of farming enterprises, were similar to those given by people who classified themselves as farmers.

Seventeen percent of the Plan Service sample and 12 percent of the Iowa Extension sample were in occupations that seemed unrelated to farming. These occupations included students, accountants, florists, lawyers, mechanics, and 32 other distinct occupations. A complete listing of these occupations is in Appendix B. Many of the people in these occupations expressed a connection with farmers or farm managers. Some were directly connected with farming on a part-time basis. Many raised small numbers of livestock or had a personal interest in the livestock raised by others.

The users whose occupation was other than farming requested 65 percent of the Beef books and 60 percent of the Swine books, but only 40 percent of all plans.

Table 5. Occupation of users and number of users in each occupation

Occupation	MWPS sample		Iowa Ext. sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farmer	176	49.5	35	70.0
Banker	2	0.5	-	-
County agent	27	7.5	-	-
Teacher	5	1.5	-	-
Contractor	9	2.5	2	4.0
Salesman	11	3.0	2	4.0
Combination ^a	31	8.7	3	6.0
No response	32	9.0	2	4.0
Other	63	17.8	6	12.0
Total	356	100.0	50	100.0

^aThese users were farmers who had another major job or were part-time farmers.

Table 6. Percentage of users in each occupation and publication group

Occupation	Publication				
	Beef book	Swine book	Swine plans ^a	Beef plans ^b	Other plans ^c
Farmer	34.5	40.8	62.8	64.1	34.8
Banker	1.2	1.9	-	-	-
County agent	15.5	13.0	4.2	-	6.5
Teacher	1.2	3.7	-	2.6	-
Contractor	1.2	5.5	1.1	-	8.7
Salesman	3.7	-	5.3	1.3	4.4
Combination	9.5	7.4	6.4	10.3	10.8
No response	10.6	11.0	8.5	7.7	6.5
Other	22.6	16.7	11.7	14.0	28.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responders	84	54	94	78	46

^aPlans 72676, 72675, and 72678

^bPlans 72425 and 72426

^cPlan 72754 and other plans

Types and Sizes of Farming Enterprises

Livestock

Forty-three percent of all users and 23 percent of the farmers do not raise beef cattle. Fifty-eight percent of all users and 36 percent of the farmers do not raise hogs.

A very small number of users raise dairy cattle or poultry. This is not representative of all users of Plan Service publications as the publications selected for this study were primarily for beef cattle or swine facilities.

Twenty-seven percent of all users and 34 percent of the farmers raise from 1 to 100 beef cattle. Eleven percent of all users and 16 percent of the farmers raise from 100 to 200 beef cattle. Eight percent of all users and 10 percent of the farmers raise over 500 head of beef cattle.

Six percent of all users and nine percent of the farmers raise from 1 to 100 hogs. Three percent of all users and five percent of the farmers raise from 100 to 200 hogs. Thirteen percent of all users and 20 percent of the farmers raise from 200 to 500 hogs. Twenty percent of all users and 30 percent of the farmers raise over 500 hogs.

Crops

Thirty percent of all users and 31 percent of the farmers raise from 1 to 200 acres of corn. Thirty-seven percent of all users and 52 percent of the farmers raise from 1 to 100 acres of hay. Seventeen percent of all users and 26 percent of the farmers raise from 1 to 200 acres of beans. Nineteen percent of all users and 33 percent of the farmers raise from 1 to 100 acres of wheat.

Fifty-four percent of the Iowa users raise from 1 to 200 acres of corn; 62 percent raise from 1 to 100 acres of hay; and 48 percent raise from 1 to 200 acres of beans. These percentages are greater than for the Plan Service sample.

Table 7. Percentage of farmers raising livestock^a (Plan Service sample of 175 farmers)

Number of animals	Livestock				
	Beef Cattle	Dairy Cattle	Swine	Poultry	Others ^c
None ^b	23.0	91.5	36.0	88.7	93.4
1 to 99	34.2	8.0	8.6	1.7	1.0
100 to 199	16.0	0.5	4.6	1.1	1.7
200 to 299	10.2	-	9.1	1.1	1.1
300 to 399	4.0	-	5.1	-	1.1
400 to 499	2.3	-	6.3	2.3	-
500 to 740	4.0	-	11.4	0.5	-
750 up	6.3	-	18.9	4.6	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^aThe table contains the livestock numbers for those who classified themselves as farmers.

^bA zero number or a no response to that particular livestock.

^cPrimarily sheep.

Table 8. Percentage of users raising beef cattle

Number of beef	Publication					Totals
	Beef book	Swine book	Swine plans	Beef plans	Other plans	
None ^a	35.7	61.1	49.0	14.0	74.0	43.2
1 to 99	35.7	31.5	25.5	20.5	19.4	27.0
100 to 199	13.1	3.7	17.0	12.8	2.2	11.2
200 to 299	2.4	3.7	5.3	18.0	2.2	6.7
300 to 399	1.2	-	-	9.0	-	2.3
400 to 499	2.4	-	-	5.1	-	1.7
500 to 749	2.4	-	-	10.3	2.2	3.1
750 up	7.1	-	3.2	10.3	-	4.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responders	84	54	94	78	46	356

^aA zero number or a no response for beef.

Table 9. Percentage of users raising swine

Number of swine	Publication					Totals
	Beef book	Swine book	Swine plans	Beef plans	Other plans	
None ^a	87.0	48.2	24.5	65.5	74.0	58.2
1 to 99	5.9	7.4	5.3	3.8	8.6	5.9
100 to 199	1.2	5.5	1.1	5.2	4.3	3.1
200 to 299	2.3	7.4	7.4	6.4	2.2	5.3
300 to 399	1.2	5.5	6.4	3.8	2.2	3.9
400 to 499	-	1.8	10.6	3.8	-	3.9
500 to 749	1.2	7.4	17.0	3.8	2.2	7.1
750 up	1.2	16.8	27.7	7.7	6.5	12.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responders	84	54	94	78	46	356

^aA zero number or a no response for swine.

Table 10. Percentage of farmers raising crops (Plan Service sample of 175 farmers)

Number of acres	Crop					Other ^a
	Corn	Hay	Beans	Wheat	Barley	
None ^b	31.4	24.6	68.5	47.5	85.2	77.7
1 to 99	24.0	52.5	17.2	33.7	7.4	13.7
100 to 199	17.2	14.8	9.1	4.6	2.3	5.7
200 to 299	14.2	4.0	2.9	4.0	2.3	0.6
300 to 399	5.7	2.9	1.7	5.1	1.7	1.1
400 to 499	3.4	0.6	0.6	1.1	-	-
500 to 749	2.3	0.6	-	2.9	-	0.6
750 up	1.1	-	-	1.1	1.1	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^aThese crops included pasture, oats and milo.

^bA zero number or a no response to that crop.

Table 11. Percentage of users raising crops (Plan Service sample of 356 responders)

Number of acres	Crop				
	Corn	Hay	Beans	Wheat	Barley
None ^a	54.5	48.6	79.5	70.6	90.4
1 to 99	19.4	37.1	12.1	19.4	5.1
100 to 199	10.7	8.4	5.3	2.5	1.4
200 to 299	8.4	3.1	1.7	1.9	1.4
300 to 399	3.4	1.9	1.1	2.8	0.8
400 to 499	1.7	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.3
500 to 749	1.1	0.3	-	1.4	-
750 up	0.8	0.3	-	0.6	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^aA zero number or a no response to that crop.

Table 12. Percentage of users raising livestock and crops (Iowa Extension sample of 50 responders)

Number of animals or acres	Livestock		Crops		
	Beef	Swine	Corn	Hay	Beans
None ^a	26	32	24	34	46
1 to 99	38	8	26	62	36
100 to 199	16	-	28	4	12
200 to 299	8	10	12	-	-
300 to 399	6	4	2	-	-
400 to 499	4	14	-	-	2
500 to 749	-	20	4	-	-
750 up	2	12	4	-	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100

^aA zero number or a no response to that animal or crop.

Types of Information Desired

Both farmers and those in other occupations ordered the publications for many of the same reasons. Approximately 60 percent of the farmers and 35 percent of those in other occupations were planning to expand their livestock facilities. Thirty-eight percent of those in non-farming occupations wanted a livestock book to help a friend, neighbor, or client, while only two percent of the farmers expressed this reason.

Approximately 50 percent of all users were collecting information for future use. Twenty-four percent of the farmer book users and 29 percent of the non-farmer book users were beginning a livestock enterprise. This farmer-user percentage was similar to the percentage of farmers who did not raise livestock or did not list any livestock.

Fifty-nine percent of the farmer plan users and 56 percent of the non-farmer plan users wanted plans for a new building. Thirty-two percent of the farmer book users and 37 percent of the non-farmer book users wanted the same information. The book users had no chance of receiving these desired plans as the livestock books do not contain construction drawings for buildings.

Thirty-seven percent of the farmer book users and 34 percent of the farmer plan users wanted help in planning the arrangement of a building. Forty-three percent of all book users wanted plans for feeders, and 20 percent wanted information that would help with remodeling.

Thirty-nine percent of farmer plan users and 33 percent of non-farmer plan users wanted information on manure disposal. Twenty percent of farmer book users and 27 percent of the non-farmer book users wanted the same information.

Other items that over 20 percent of the users wanted included: management information, ventilation information, plans for equipment, and information on

feeding.

A complete listing of the reasons given for ordering and the percentage of users stating each reason is shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Percentage of users ordering publications for various reasons (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples)

Reason for ordering	Number in group	Books		Plans	
		Farmers 66	Others 98	Farmers 145	Others 97
Beginning a livestock enterprise		24.2	28.6	9.0	13.4
Planning to expand present system		57.6	29.6	65.5	38.2
Collect information for future use		50.0	55.1	55.9	45.4
Planning the arrangement of a building		37.9	25.5	34.5	35.1
To assist a friend, neighbor, or client		1.5	38.8	2.8	26.4
Wanted a plan to hand a builder		3.0	8.2	5.5	6.2
PLANS FOR					
New building		31.8	36.8	59.3	55.6
Useful for remodeling		22.8	19.4	18.6	12.4
Feeders		41.0	43.9	6.2	11.4
Equipment		19.7	24.5	2.8	2.1
INFORMATION ON					
Sanitation		7.6	10.2	11.8	16.5
Breeding		7.6	15.3	4.8	7.2
Feeding		28.8	30.6	22.1	21.7
Remodeling ideas		39.4	26.6	24.1	23.7
Management		16.7	24.5	14.5	14.4
Ventilation		16.7	17.3	24.1	26.8
Manure disposal		22.8	18.4	39.3	33.0
Slotted floors		19.7	26.6	42.0	30.9

User's Opinion on Quantity of Information Received

Of all publication users, 51 percent expressed the opinion that they had received all the information desired. Thirty-eight percent received only part of the desired information. Nine percent did not express an opinion, and 1.5 percent said they received none of the desired information.

Sixty-three percent of the Beef book users, 55 percent of the Swine book users,

58 percent of the swine plans users, 32 percent of the beef plans users, and 45 percent of other plans users received the desired information. Fifty percent of the beef plans users and 48 percent of other plans users said they received part of the desired information.

Table 14. Percentage of users receiving the information desired (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples, by occupation of users)

Occupation	Number in group	Answer checked			
		Yes	No	Partially	No response
Farmer	211	47.4	1.4	42.6	8.6
Banker	2	-	-	100.0	-
County agent	27	74.1	-	18.5	7.4
Teacher	5	40.0	-	60.0	-
Contractor	11	36.4	-	54.5	9.1
Salesman	13	61.5	-	38.5	-
Combination	34	61.8	5.9	32.3	-
No response	34	35.3	2.9	26.5	35.3
Other	69	59.4	-	34.8	5.8
Total	406	51.2	1.4	38.2	9.1

Table 15. Percentage of users receiving the information desired (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples, by publication ordered)

Publication	Number in group	Answer checked			
		Yes	No	Partially	No response
Beef book	98	63.3	-	28.6	8.1
Swine book	66	54.5	-	33.4	12.1
Swine plans ^a	102	57.8	1.0	35.3	5.9
Beef plans ^b	94	31.9	4.3	50.0	13.8
Other plans ^c	46	45.5	2.2	47.9	4.4
Total	406	51.2	1.5	38.2	9.1

^aPlans 72676, 72675 and 72678.

^bPlans 72425 and 72426.

^cPlan 72754 and other plans.

How the Publications Were Used

The users were asked to tell how the plan or book has been used or would be used. The percentage of respondents listed in Table 16 is based on both types of answers. Table 17 shows the percentage of respondents that actually used the publication for help with constructing a building or a piece of equipment.

The books were used, or would be used, by 45 percent of the respondents for planning a layout. Thirty percent of the farmers and 33 percent of the non-farmers checked the use "planning building materials". Twenty-one percent of the farmers and 18 percent of the non-farmers used, or would use, the books when planning the arrangement of a building. Thirty-nine percent of the farmer book users and 29 percent of the non-farmer book users constructed, or would construct, some of the equipment detailed in the books.

One-third of the Beef book users and 13 percent of the Swine book users said they actually constructed some piece of equipment from a plan in the books, and over 90 percent of these users did their own constructing.

The plans were used, or would be used, most for planning layouts - 33 percent of the farmers and 46 percent of other occupations; for planning building arrangements - 34 percent of all occupations; and for constructing a building - 35 percent of the farmers and 27 percent of other occupations. Other uses, or future uses, most often checked included: (a) planning ventilation systems, (b) planning building materials, and (c) for constructing part of a building.

Very few of the plan users said they actually constructed the building detailed in the plan. Approximately ten percent of all plan users said they had used some or all of the construction information. The information in plan 72676 was used by 15 people - more than for any other plan.

Table 16. Percentage of respondents using the publications for various tasks
(Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples)

Expressed uses Number in group	Books		Plans	
	Farmers 66	Others 98	Farmers 145	Others 97
FOR PLANNING				
Layout	44.0	45.0	33.1	46.4
Manure disposal	18.2	12.3	16.5	21.6
Sanitation	7.6	12.3	2.8	14.4
Management	18.2	15.3	6.9	10.3
Ventilation	18.2	13.3	17.9	19.6
Building arrangement	21.2	18.4	34.5	34.0
Building materials	30.3	32.6	19.3	14.4
For or with a client	-	30.6	0.7	18.5
FOR CONSTRUCTION				
Complete building	13.6	24.5	35.2	27.8
Part of a building	24.2	11.2	16.5	18.5
Equipment	39.4	28.6	2.8	4.1
Trusses	1.5	3.1	11.0	6.2
Floor	12.1	4.1	10.3	9.3
Ventilation system	10.6	7.2	8.3	9.3
FOR REMODELING				
Floors	12.1	4.1	9.0	10.3
Ventilation system	7.6	4.1	4.1	7.2
Manure disposal system	13.6	7.2	10.3	9.3
Feeding system	21.2	18.4	8.3	9.3

Table 17. Percentage of respondents actually building from the publication

Completed project	Books	Plans
Complete building	3.0	10.7
Part of a building	3.7	3.3
Equipment	25.0	-

Where Users Learned About Publications

Fifty-four percent of all respondents and 65 percent of the farmers learned about their publication through magazines. Approximately 70 percent of the plan users and 35 percent of the book users learned of the publication through a magazine.

Fifteen percent of all respondents and 17 percent of the farmers learned of their publication through a county agent. Thirty-six percent of the Beef book users and 41 percent of the Swine book users learned of their publication from various other sources. These sources included university specialists, salesmen, neighbors, teachers, and textbooks.

Table 18. Percentage of users learning about publication from various sources (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples, by occupation of users)

Occupation	Number in group	Source names				
		Radio & TV	Magazines ^a	MWPS Cat. ^b	County agent	Others ^c
Farmer	210	0.5	65.2	2.4	17.6	14.3
Banker	2	-	50.0	-	-	50.0
County agent	26	-	3.8	15.4	23.1	57.7
Teacher	5	-	40.0	-	-	60.0
Contractor	10	-	30.0	30.0	10.0	30.0
Salesman	13	-	23.1	15.4	7.7	53.8
Combination	34	-	61.9	8.9	8.9	20.3
No response	32	-	62.5	-	12.5	25.0
Other	69	-	42.0	8.7	11.6	37.7
Total	401	0.3	54.1	5.7	15.0	24.9

^aThe names of the magazines are listed in Footnote a, Table 19.

^bMidwest Plan Service Catalogs.

^cThe names of these other sources are listed in Footnote c, Table 19.

Table 19. Percentage of users learning about publication from various sources
(Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples, by publication
ordered)

Publication	Number in group	Source named				
		Radio & TV	Magazines ^a	MWPS Cat. ^b	County agent	Others ^c
Beef book	95	-	39.0	5.2	20.0	35.8
Swine book	65	-	27.7	10.8	20.0	41.5
Swine plans	102	1.0	69.6	2.0	12.7	14.7
Beef plans	94	-	72.4	3.2	10.6	13.8
Other plans	45	-	51.1	13.3	11.1	24.5
Total	401	0.3	54.1	5.7	15.0	24.9

^aThe magazines included:

Farm Journal
Successful Farming
National Hog Farmer
Angus Journal
Life at its best
Oregon Farmer
Beef
Canadian Cattlemen
Progressive Farmer
Idaho Farmer
Wallaces Farmer

National Livestock Producer
Farm Quarterly
Nebraska Farmer
Hog Management
Dronus Journal
Hog and Farm Management
Western Livestock Journal
Prairie Farmer
Poultry Tribune
Hoard's Dairyman

^bMidwest Plan Service Catalogs

^cOther sources included:

University specialists
Farm Bureau
Salesmen
Public power services
Industrial relations specialists
Textbooks

Short courses
Neighbors
Doanes Digest
Feed Dealers
Agricultural engineers

User Suggestions for Future Publications

Many of the respondents gave excellent suggestions of subject matter that could be included in future publications. Some of the respondents suggested subjects that are contained in other current publications. Others suggested subjects that had previously been considered by the Plan Service Committee and intentionally omitted. Some suggestions were for subjects that are not presently included in the present fields of interest of the Midwest Plan Service.

A listing of all suggestions is shown in Appendix A.

User Ratings of the Usefulness of the Publications

The users were asked to rate the sections of the publication with the following scale:

1. Very useful
2. Useful when modified
3. Needs to be expanded
4. Did not believe
5. Did not understand
6. Could not use

Approximately 50 percent of the book users did not rate the publication. Of those who rated, less than one percent did not believe the information or did not understand what was presented.

The parts of the books containing planning explanations and directions were rated "very useful" by 43 percent of the respondents. The sections containing plans for feeders and bunks, information on feeder design, fence construction details, and general materials information received a "very useful" rating by 35 to 38 percent

of the book users. From 5 to 8 percent of the book users rated sections as "needs to be expanded".

Approximately 60 percent of the swine plans users did not rate the publications. Of those who rated, one to two percent rated some section as "did not believe" or "did not understand".

Thirty-four percent of the swine plans users rated the floor plan section of the plans as "very useful". Other plan sections that over 20 percent of the users rated "very useful" were (a) ventilation explanation, (b) manure disposal details, (c) typical construction detail, and (d) truss details.

A listing of the book and plan sections and their ratings is in Tables 20, 21, and 22.

Table 20. Percentage of users rating various sections of the Beef book and Swine book (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples of 164 responses)

Section of book	T	Rating ^a				
		2	3	4	5	6
Planning explanations and directions	42.6	11.6	4.9	-	-	1.8
Floor plans and/or layouts	27.8	17.7	7.9	-	0.6	3.7
Ventilation explanation and details	19.5	13.4	6.7	0.6	0.6	6.1
Manure disposal information and details	19.5	11.0	8.5	0.6	-	6.1
Information on feeder design	35.4	13.4	4.3	1.2	-	5.5
Plans for feeders and bunks	37.2	12.2	4.3	0.6	-	5.5
Plans for other equipment	26.2	9.2	8.5	0.6	-	3.7
Windbreak planning	18.9	9.2	6.7	-	-	9.2
Fence construction details	37.8	7.3	5.5	-	-	4.3
Slotted floor details	20.7	6.7	8.5	-	-	9.2
General information on last 9 pages	38.4	4.9	3.7	-	-	1.8

^aThe rating numbers mean:

- (1) very useful
 (2) useful when modified
 (3) needs to be expanded
 (4) did not believe

(5) did not understand

(6) could not use

(7) no response to that section

Table 21. Percentage of users rating various sections of the swine plans^a (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples of 102 responses)

Section of plan	Rating ^b						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Floor plans	34.3	17.6	2.0	-	-	2.0	44.1
Wall section	17.6	12.7	3.9	-	-	2.9	62.7
Ventilation explanation	20.6	10.8	5.9	2.0	1.0	2.9	56.9
Ventilation details	18.6	8.8	6.9	2.0	1.0	2.9	58.7
Management suggestions	14.7	12.7	4.9	-	1.0	1.0	65.7
Manure disposal details	24.5	12.7	5.9	-	-	2.0	54.9
Door details	12.7	14.7	2.0	-	-	5.9	62.7
Feeder and bunk details	6.9	7.8	2.9	1.0	-	7.8	73.5
Typical construction detail	22.5	11.8	2.0	-	1.0	1.0	61.7
Material curing list	13.7	10.8	1.0	-	-	6.9	67.6
Truss details	21.6	8.8	1.0	-	-	6.9	61.7
Equipment details	19.8	7.8	3.9	2.0	-	3.9	71.5

^aPlans 72676, 72675 and 72678.

^bSee footnote a, Table 20.

Table 22. Percentage of users rating various sections of other plans^a (Combined Plan Service and Iowa Extension samples of 140 responses)

Section of plan	Rating ^b						
	T	2	3	4	5	6	7
Floor plans	14.3	10.7	-	-	-	6.4	68.5
Wall sections	10.7	11.4	-	-	-	3.6	73.6
Ventilation explanation	9.3	9.3	3.6	-	-	3.6	73.6
Ventilation details	8.6	8.6	2.1	-	-	5.7	75.0
Management suggestions	7.9	7.2	1.4	-	-	5.0	78.6
Manure disposal details	3.6	9.3	5.0	0.7	-	6.4	75.0
Door details	7.2	6.4	1.4	-	0.7	5.0	79.4
Feeder and bunk details	10.0	8.6	0.7	-	-	5.0	75.7
Typical construction detail	12.9	6.4	1.4	-	-	4.3	75.7
Material cutting list	9.3	3.6	0.7	-	-	4.3	82.2
Truss details	14.3	5.0	-	-	0.7	5.0	75.0
Equipment details	5.0	2.9	3.6	-	-	5.7	83.0

^aPlans 72425, 72426, 72754, and others.

^bSee footnote a, Table 20.

Users Receiving the Requested Publication

A small percentage, five to eight percent at the 99 percent confidence interval, of the people who order publications do not receive them. Most of the respondents who had not received their publication answered the first five questions on the questionnaire. The questionnaire contained this request, and most followed it before returning the questionnaire.

The people who said they had not received a publication were sent a duplicate publication. A separate letter was sent which tried to explain the inconvenience. The letter also contained the request to write the author if their publication did not arrive in the following two weeks.

Table 23. Percentage of respondents that actually received the publication ordered

Publication	Midwest Plan Service sample			Iowa Extension sample		
	Received	Did not receive	No response ^a	Received	Did not receive	No response ^a
Beef book	87.0	3.5	9.5	78.5	7.2	14.3
Swine book	76.0	18.5	5.5	83.4	16.6	-
Plan 72676	92.8	1.4	5.8	75.0	-	25.0
Plan 72425	80.0	14.0	6.0	87.5	-	12.5
Plan 72426	89.5	10.5	-	100.0	-	-
Plan 72754	100.0	-	-			
Plan 72675	100.0	-	-			
Plan 72678	92.0	-	8.0			
Other plans	95.0	2.5	2.5			
Total	87.5	7.0	5.5	84.0	6.0	10.0

^aThese people were considered as having received the original publication and were therefore not sent a duplicate.

DISCUSSION

The discussion presentation is divided into three parts: (a) Recommendations based on the author's search and study of literature that was pertinent to the present study. These recommendations are the author's interpretations of reported and proven communications principles. These principles have been reworded to show how they could be used in the operations of the Midwest Plan Service. (b) Recommendations based on the findings of this study. (c) Suggestions for future study.

Recommendations Based on Literature Review

1. The Plan Service should continually attempt to determine the type and quality of information its potential users want to have. To do this, the Plan Service should initiate an on-going procedure for "knowing the audience". "Knowing the audience" includes knowing the potential user's types and sizes of operations.
2. The Plan Service should continually determine how its publications are used. The Plan Service should recognize that information is often sought to reinforce an existing idea, and that if a publication's objective is to impart new information or attitudes, it must first gain the confidence of the audience by satisfying its existing needs.
3. The Plan Service should recognize and use the farmer's commonly-used procedures of adoption. The farmer who requests a publication is at some stage in the adoption process. He is also a potential part of some other farmer's adoption process. The majority of requesters are probably at the stage where they are looking for directions and guidance to implement an idea. Plan Service publications should contain information that will correct any possible errors in a user's knowledge of an idea or practice, and should guide the requester to the correct implementation

of the idea into his enterprise.

4. The Plan Service should continually up-grade its image. It can do this by answering the recognized needs of its users. It can then present answers to the needs that are known to the authors, but are unrecognized by the users.

5. The Plan Service should spend much effort for publicity for its publications. It should use the common sources of information of the audience of a publication. To do this, the personnel of the Plan Service must keep up-to-date on the findings of communications research.

6. The Plan Service personnel should keep up-to-date and use the rules of "rhetoric" as established by professionals in communication.

7. Plan Service publications should be as short as possible. In many cases, a total subject cannot be covered in a short publication. In such cases, the sections within the publication should be short and clearly separated from the other sections. Cross-referencing between sections should be avoided, where possible.

Recommendations Based on the Findings From This Study

1. Many producers of small numbers of livestock want and use Plan Service publications. Some of the information in publications should be written for these small enterprises. The information should be that which can help make these small enterprises more efficient, not larger.

2. Many users were collecting information for future use, and many were planning to expand their enterprises, but very few said they used any of the construction information contained in their publications. Only ten percent of those ordering plans had used any of the construction information. On the other hand, one-third of the book users said they wanted plans for buildings, and one-fourth

had constructed some piece of small equipment from a plan in the book.

More information is needed before a definite recommendation can be made, but the answers seem to indicate that construction information could be minimized in future publications. The livestock books should contain explanatory information, new ideas and suggestions, instructions and procedures for implementing an idea or practice, and a listing of where and what building and equipment plans are available. This recommendation is based, in part, on an interpretation from the literature review.

Plans should contain explanatory information along with the construction information. Or, if the plans contain only construction information, they should be sent only with another publication that contains explanatory information, or should be sent only after it is known that the potential user has read some explanatory information and knows just what he will be receiving.

3. Many users found that the information in their publication was useful only when they had modified it. Because there is usually a good and a bad way of modifying an idea or practice, the Plan Service publications should contain instructions on how to modify the information to fit other situations.

4. All publications should contain introductory explanations that will inform the user as to the size and type of enterprise for which the information is useful. If information for more than one size of enterprise is in one publication, then each section or bit of information should be clearly identified.

5. Some, if not all, publications should contain information that can be used effectively by those people who help, or are in a position to help, others. Thirty percent of the non-farmer book users and 18 percent of the non-farmer plan users said they used, or would use, their publication to help others. The information

most useful to these helpers probably should be quite technical and explanatory in nature, and in most cases, it will educate the helpers as they, in turn, educate others.

The Plan Service should also utilize the farmer's commonly-used procedure of adoption. The most common source of help and information is other farmers, therefore educating the farmer-user will, in many cases, help other farmers.

6. Many users of Plan Service publications are in occupations that seem unrelated to farming. Other users are just beginning a farming enterprise. These users would be better served with many explanations, procedures, and background information. Some publications and/or parts of all publications should be written for these people.

7. The respondents' suggestions for new publications should be considered and, in some cases, reconsidered by the cooperators and planners of Plan Service publications for inclusion in future publications. Some of the suggestions have been considered in past years by the Plan Service, and have been intentionally omitted because they were outside the fields of interest or were judged to be adequately explained in other publications.

Even if, after reconsidering all suggestions, the Plan Service planners do not include the desired material in future publications, the publications should contain instructions and directions that can help the user obtain his desired information from some other source.

8. Some of the respondents' suggestions indicate that many do not know about all of the available publications. The Plan Service should expand its publicity efforts and make use of the sources of information of most farmers. Suggestion: One very commonly-used source is other farmers, so if a catalog is sent with every

filled request, the neighboring farmers might eventually learn of Plan Service publications.

9. Publicity releases should be descriptive and complete. Thirty-eight percent of the users were only partially satisfied with the publications. Descriptive and complete publicity will let the user know in advance just what is included in the publication.

Suggestions for Future Study

1. Study the users who order from the individual states that are part of the Midwest Plan Service. The data could be analyzed by a method similar to the one used for this investigation.

2. Survey the extension engineers of the cooperating states to find the needs in their educational programs. The answers from these engineers would indicate the types of unrecognized needs that these professional helpers feel should be answered in publications. Their answers would also reflect the recognized needs of past clients.

3. Survey the county agents to see how they actually use existing publications and what additional publications they feel are needed for their programs and requests.

4. Repeat this or a similar study periodically.

5. Survey the users of other publications available from the Plan Service.

6. Study the problem of users not receiving their ordered publications, and study ways of eliminating this inconvenience.

7. Study the activities and farm-related interests of those whose occupations are other than farming. Find their needs - recognized and unrecognized.

8. Study the user's opinions on the price of the publication. Does he feel he is getting his money's worth, or is he paying too much?

9. Study more closely the user's desires and practices concerning construction information.

SUMMARY

The investigation concerned the educational publication agency, Midwest Plan Service. The objectives of the investigation were to obtain further knowledge and understanding about the users of Plan Service publications, and to determine how publications were used.

Seven hundred requesters of selected Plan Service publications were sent a questionnaire that requested answers that would provide the following information:

1. Occupation
2. Type and size of farming enterprises
3. Reasons for requesting publication
4. Satisfaction with publication content
5. Use made of the publication
6. Where the requester learned of the publication
7. Suggestions for future publications
8. Judgments on specific sections in a publication

Eighty-two of those sent questionnaires had ordered their publication from Extension Agricultural Engineers at Iowa State University. Fifty of this Iowa Extension sample returned the questionnaire. The other 618 requesters sent questionnaires had ordered their publication from the Midwest Plan Service Headquarters. Some of these requesters had ordered two publications and were sent two questionnaires. Three hundred thirty-two of this sample either returned the questionnaire or responded in some other way.

From the 382 people (55 percent) who returned their questionnaire, the following information was obtained:

Occupation of Users

Fifty-two percent (176) of the Plan Service sample and 70 percent (35) of the Iowa Extension sample are full-time farmers. Eighteen percent (68) of the combined samples gave answers concerning size of farming enterprises that were similar to those of farmers.

Eighteen percent (63) of the Plan Service sample and 12 percent (6) of the Iowa Extension sample were in occupations that seemed unrelated to farming. Some of the people in these occupations expressed a connection with farming on a part-time basis. Many raised small numbers of livestock or had a personal interest in the livestock raised by others.

Farmers ordered 60 percent of all plans, but only 35 percent of the Beef books and 40 percent of the Swine books. The Beef and Swine books are explanatory in format while plans contain construction information for a specific building. The farmers seemed to want information that would assist or complement an already-made decision. The people in other occupations seemed to want information and ideas from which to make decisions.

Type and Size of Farming Enterprises

Approximately one-half of the respondents do not raise livestock of any kind. Many of these people were in non-farming occupations or were just beginning a small enterprise. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents raise from 1 to 100 beef cattle. Eleven percent raise from 100 to 200 beef cattle, and eight percent raise over 500 beef cattle.

Six percent of the users raise from 1 to 100 hogs. Three percent raise from 100 to 200 hogs, 13 percent raise from 200 to 500 hogs, and 20 percent raise over

500 hogs.

Respondents from the Iowa sample had enterprises that were somewhat larger than those of the Plan Service sample.

Reasons for Requesting Publication

Farmers

Fifty-seven percent of book users and 65 percent of plan users were planning to expand their livestock facilities. Fifty percent of book users and 56 percent of plan users were collecting information for future use. Twenty-four percent of the book users and nine percent of the plan users were beginning a livestock enterprise.

Some other reasons and the percentages of farmers checking them were: planning the arrangement of a building - 38 percent of book users and 34 percent of plan users; plans for a new building - 32 percent of book users and 59 percent of plan users; plans for feeders - 41 percent of book users; information on remodeling - 39 percent of book users and 24 percent of plan users; and information on manure disposal - 23 percent of book users and 39 percent of plan users.

Other occupations

About the same percentages of these people checked the same items as the farmers. The one major exception was the reason "to assist a friend, neighbor, or client." Thirty-eight percent of the book users and 26 percent of the plans users checked this reason, while only approximately 2 percent of the farmers checked it.

User Satisfaction With Publication Content

Of all publication users, 50 percent expressed the opinion that they had received all the information desired. Thirty-eight percent received only part of the desired information. Nine percent did not express an opinion, and 1.5 percent said they received none of the desired information.

Approximately seven percent (28) of those responding said they had never received the requested publication.

Use Made of the Publication

Forty-five percent of the book users used, or would use, the book when planning a layout. The books were used, or would be used, by 20 percent of the farmers and 18 percent of the non-farmers for planning the arrangement of a building.

One-third of the Beef book users and 13 percent of the Swine book users said they had constructed some piece of equipment shown in the books, and over 90 percent of these people did their own constructing.

The plans were used, or would be used, by 33 percent of the farmers and 46 percent of the non-farmers for planning layouts. Thirty-four percent of all respondents planned, or would plan, a building arrangement from the plan. Thirty-five percent of the farmers and 27 percent of non-farmers used, or would use, the plan when constructing a building. Approximately 10 percent of all plan users said they had actually used some or all of the construction information contained in the plan.

Where Users Learned About Publications

Fifty-four percent of all respondents and 65 percent of the farmers learned about their publication through magazines. Approximately 70 percent of the plan users and 35 percent of the book users learned of the publication through a magazine.

Fifteen percent of all respondents and 17 percent of the farmers learned of their publication through a county agent. Thirty-six percent of the Beef book users and 41 percent of the Swine book users learned of their publication from various other sources. These sources included university specialists, salesmen, neighbors, teachers, and textbooks.

User Rating of the Usefulness of the Publications

Over one-half of the respondents did not rate the sections listed for rating. Most of these users had not actually used the publication or the section to be rated.

Of those who rated, less than one percent rated a section as "did not believe" or "did not understand." Thirty-five to 38 percent of the book users rated the following sections as very useful: (a) plans for feeders and bunks, (b) information on feeder design, (c) fence construction details, and (d) the general materials information section. Forty-three percent of the book users rated the parts of a book containing planning explanations and directions as "very useful." Five to 8 percent of the book users rated sections as "needs to be expanded."

A listing of the book and plan sections and their ratings is in Tables 20, 21, and 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berkland, William R. The influence of effort in acquiring a publication on its readership and acceptance. Unpublished M.S. thesis. Ames, Iowa, Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1965.
2. Hyman, H. and Sheatsley, P. Some reasons why information campaigns fail. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11:412-423. 1947.
3. Klapper, Joseph T. The social effects of mass communication. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. *The science of human communication*. pp. 65-76. New York, New York, Basic Books, Inc. 1963.
4. Lassahn, Pamela. A comparison of editorial judgments of five groups in an agricultural science information system. Unpublished M.S. thesis. Ames, Iowa, Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1966.
5. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Menzel, Herbert. Mass media and personal influence. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. *The science of human communication*. pp. 94-113. New York, New York, Basic Books, Inc. 1963.
6. Lionberger, Herbert F. Adoption of new ideas and practices. Ames, Iowa, Iowa State University Press. 1960.
7. Lionberger, Herbert F. Information seeking habits and characteristics of farm operations. *Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin* 581. 1955.
8. Midwest Plan Service. Midwest Plan Service 1966 activities. Unpublished multigraphed report. Ames, Iowa, Midwest Plan Service Headquarters, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1966.
9. Pedersen, J. H. Midwest Plan Service progress report. Unpublished mimeographed report. Ames, Iowa, Midwest Plan Service Headquarters, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1956.
10. Pedersen, J. H. The Midwest Plan Service. Unpublished mimeographed report. Ames, Iowa, Midwest Plan Service Headquarters, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1957.
11. Phifer, Bryan, Judkins, Beatrice, and Frutchey, Fred. The Vermont publications study. United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service Circular 536. 1961.

12. Schramm, Wilbur. Communication research in the United States. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The science of human communication. pp. 1-15. New York, New York, Basic Books, Inc. 1963.
13. Schramm, Wilbur. How communication works. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The process and effects of mass communication. pp. 3-26. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press. 1955.
14. Schramm, Wilbur. The meaning of meaning. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The process and effects of mass communication. pp. 109-114. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press. 1955.
15. Schramm, Wilbur. The nature and behavior of attitudes. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The process and effects of mass communication. pp. 209-214. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press. 1955.
16. Schramm, Wilbur. The process and effects of mass communications. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press. 1955.
17. Schramm, Wilbur. The science of human communication. New York, New York, Basic Books, Inc. 1963.
18. United States Department of Agriculture. Federal Extension Service. Division of Extension Research and Training. Evaluation in extension. Topeka, Kansas, H. M. Ives and Sons, Inc. 1959.
19. Waples, Douglas, Berelson, Bernard, and Bradshaw, Franklin R. Why they read. In Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The process and effects of mass communication. pp. 56-67. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press. 1955.

APPENDIX A. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE PUBLICATIONS

From Beef Book Users

Buildings and equipment

- Pole type equipment
- Scales
- Open front shelters
- Two movable sides on cattle chute
- More on working chutes
- Squeeze chute
- More ideas even if details are cut down
- Steel bins and construction details
- Building and truss plans
- More headgates

Feeding information

- Sheltered fence line bunks for northern climates
- Loose hay fence line feeder - large capacity
- Trench silo construction
- Feeding systems information and layouts - pros and cons
- Completely automated systems
- Screw conveyor feeding
- Self-unloading concrete silo - above and below ground
- Grain storage
- High moisture corn and feeding center

Other

- Back yard equipment - outdoor living
- Farrowing house plans
- Breeding information
- Hay barns
- Information on weights of livestock
- Performance and carcass evaluation
- Record systems

From Swine Book Users

Buildings and equipment

More metal projects and equipment
 Open-front finishing house
 Liquid-feed mix tank
 A plan for farrowing, nursery, and finishing under one roof
 More on slotted floors
 Pole type buildings

Other

Plan for a simple limit-feeding system
 Manure pumps
 Swine confinement feeding systems
 More on ventilation and control of disease
 Bulk feed and grain storage
 Milking equipment

From Plan 72676 Users

Buildings and equipment

Movable finishing shed
 More modern buildings as used today
 Feeding facilities
 Creep feeder
 Hog and cattle feeding and handling equipment

Other swine subjects

The plans need to present many ideas
 Automatic feed systems
 Liquid manure systems
 Sow stanchions

Other

Need more publicity on availability of plans
 Beef confinement plans and feedlot plans
 Information on low-moisture silage
 Effective stock working corral

From Plans 72425 and 72426 Users

Buildings and equipment

Feeding equipment plans
 Small scale building
 Cattle sheds
 Automatic cattle feeder
 Feedroom - meters, etc.

Other beef subjects

Manure disposal plans
 Manure disposal systems and housing not requiring bedding
 Grain handling and feed processing
 Storage plans
 Baled hay storage and feeding barn

Other

Hog finishing plans
 Management of tax problems
 "How to build" information rather than plans

From Other Plans Users

Buildings and equipment

Poultry manure disposal - automatic
 Partial slot starting house
 Specifications on construction - for buildings
 Utility sheds, pole and barn
 More explanations of overall function of plans - narrative form

Feeding information

More details on cages, types of waterers, feeders, feed carts, etc.
 Cost breakdown on raising poultry, etc.
 Hog feeders
 Self feeders - hogs
 Self feeders - cattle
 Six or eight sided chopped hay self-feeder
 Feed handling
 Cribs

Other

Kinds, cost, etc. on insulation

Water system building plans

Hog sanitation

Recommendations for extreme cold operations

APPENDIX B. OTHER OCCUPATIONS LISTED

Beef Book Users

Mechanic	Machine shop and welder
Retired architect and engineer	Orchardist
Florist	Accountant
Student	Agway commodity technical man
Aircraft maintenance	Manager manufacturing plant
Paper mill employee	Horse trainer

Swine Book Users

Aircraft maintenance
 Printer
 Market manager, Reynolds Metal Co., Aluminum Farm Products
 Student
 Agricultural Engineer

Plan 72676 Users

Director of animal health and nutrition research
 Feed manufacturer
 Brick mason
 Insurance broker
 District manager, Central Soya
 Veterinarian
 Real estate

Plans 724425 and 72426 Users

Potato packing shed operator	Student
Veterinarian	Meat packing
Doctor	Rocco Feeds, Inc. - Executive
Assembler - Frigidaire of Canada	Harvestore salesman
Drug storeowner	Feed mill manager
Engineer	Nutritionist at Hubbard Milling Co.
Nutrena Feed - product department	

All other Plan Users

Beef manager in packing plant
Factory skilled trades
Management consultant
Oil
Nutritionist
Grocery store operator
Warehouse worker
Aircraft maintenance
Store operator

Lumber dealer
PCA field office manager
Real estate
Insurance
Orthodontist
Veterinarian
Engineer
Attorney

APPENDIX C. CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRES



MIDWEST PLAN SERVICE

Agricultural Engineering • Iowa State University • Ames, Iowa 50010

AN ACTIVITY OF NORTH CENTRAL LAND GRANT UNIVERSITIES, USDA COOPERATING

John P. Doe
Address
City and State

Dear Mr. Doe:

During the past year you requested the book, Swine Equipment Plans, MWPS-8, from the Midwest Plan Service, located at Iowa State University. I hope you have found this book helpful, and would like your answers to a few questions concerning its usefulness to you.

Your answers, and those of other users, will be studied and applied to future and revised Plan Service publications to help improve their quality and usefulness.

The enclosed envelop has been addressed and stamped to assist you in making an early reply. Thank you for your interest and answers.

Sincerely yours,

David N. Gustafson
Midwest Plan Service

J

Enclosures

John P. Doe
Full name of person
typed here.

60

Book number

Please check here ☐ if you would like a free catalog of all Midwest Plan Service publications.

Did you receive the book listed in the right hand corner above? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you did not, please answer as many questions as you can before returning the questionnaire.
You will receive the book by return mail.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your occupation or business?
2. Please describe your connection or interest in this type of agricultural publication.

3. If you operate a farm, please describe your enterprises.

LIVESTOCK	<input type="checkbox"/> None	CROPS	<input type="checkbox"/> None	OTHER DESCRIPTIONS
	Number Per Year		Acres Per Year	
Beef	_____	Corn	_____	_____
Dairy	_____	Hay	_____	_____
Swine	_____	Beans	_____	_____
Poultry	_____	Wheat	_____	_____
_____	_____	Barley	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. How did you learn about the book?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> radio | <input type="checkbox"/> Plan Service catalog |
| <input type="checkbox"/> television | <input type="checkbox"/> County Agent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> magazine or newspaper | <input type="checkbox"/> other — please name |
| name — _____ | _____ |

5. What were your reasons for requesting the book? Check more than one if appropriate.

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> beginning a livestock enterprise | INFORMATION ON: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> planning to expand present system | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> collect information for future use | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> planning the arrangement of a building | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> to assist a friend, neighbor, or client | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> wanted a plan to hand a builder | |

PLANS FOR:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> new building | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> useful for remodeling | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> feeders | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> equipment — please name | |
| _____ | |

- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> sanitation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> breeding |
| <input type="checkbox"/> feeding |
| <input type="checkbox"/> remodeling ideas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ventilation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> manure disposal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> slotted floors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other — please name |

6. Did the book contain what you wanted? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially

(over please)

7. How did (or will) you use the book?

FOR PLANNING:

- ☐ layout
- ☐ manure disposal
- ☐ sanitation
- ☐ management
- ☐ ventilation
- ☐ building materials
- ☐ building arrangement
- ☐ for or with a client
- ☐ other — please name _____

FOR CONSTRUCTION:

- ☐ complete building
- ☐ part of building
- ☐ equipment — please name _____
- ☐ trusses
- ☐ floor
- ☐ ventilation system
- ☐ other — please name _____

FOR REMODELING:

- ☐ floors
- ☐ ventilation system
- ☐ manure disposal system
- ☐ feeding system
- ☐ other — please name _____

8. Please describe one or two of the projects checked in question 7.

PROJECT _____

When was it completed? _____

- By whom? ☐ Yourself
☐ Contractor
☐ Other — please name _____

Effect of project on total business?

- ☐ much improvement
- ☐ little improvement
- ☐ no improvement
- ☐ other descriptions _____

PROJECT _____

When was it completed? _____

- By whom? ☐ Yourself
☐ Contractor
☐ Other — please name _____

Effect of project on total business?

- ☐ much improvement
- ☐ little improvement
- ☐ no improvement
- ☐ other descriptions _____

9. Please rate the listed parts of the book using one of the following numbers.

1 - very useful

2 - useful when modified

3 - needs to be expanded

4 - did not believe

5 - did not understand

6 - could not use

SECTION OF BOOK

YOUR RATING

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning explanations and directions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floor plans and/or layouts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventilation explanation and details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manure disposal information and details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information on feeder design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plans for feeders and bunks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plans for other equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Windbreak planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fence construction details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slotted floor details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General information on last 9 pages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other — please list _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. What equipment plans, building plans, and informational topics would you suggest be included in some future publication?

EQUIPMENT PLANS

BUILDING PLANS

INFORMATIONAL TOPIC

11. Please make any additional comments, criticisms or suggestions.

John P. Doe
Full name of person
typed here.

Plan number

62

Please check here ☐ if you would like a free catalog of all Midwest Plan Service publications.

Did you receive the plan listed in the right hand corner above? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you did not, please answer as many questions as you can before returning the questionnaire.
You will receive the plan by return mail.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your occupation or business?
2. Please describe your connection or interest in this type of agricultural publication.

3. If you operate a farm, please describe your enterprises.

LIVESTOCK	<input type="checkbox"/> None	CROPS	<input type="checkbox"/> None	OTHER DESCRIPTIONS
	Number Per Year		Acres Per Year	
Beef	_____	Corn	_____	_____
Dairy	_____	Hay	_____	_____
Swine	_____	Beans	_____	_____
Poultry	_____	Wheat	_____	_____
_____	_____	Barley	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. How did you learn about the plan?

<input type="checkbox"/> radio	<input type="checkbox"/> Plan Service catalog
<input type="checkbox"/> television	<input type="checkbox"/> County Agent
<input type="checkbox"/> magazine or newspaper	<input type="checkbox"/> other — please name
name — _____	_____

5. What were your reasons for requesting the plan? Check more than one if appropriate.

- ☐ beginning a livestock enterprise
- ☐ planning to expand present system
- ☐ collect information for future use
- ☐ planning the arrangement of a building
- ☐ to assist a friend, neighbor, or client
- ☐ wanted a plan to hand a builder

PLANS FOR:

- ☐ new building
- ☐ useful for remodeling
- ☐ feeders
- ☐ equipment — please name

INFORMATION ON:

- ☐ sanitation
- ☐ breeding
- ☐ feeding
- ☐ remodeling ideas
- ☐ management
- ☐ ventilation
- ☐ manure disposal
- ☐ slotted floors
- ☐ other — please name

6. Did the plan contain what you wanted? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially

(over please)

7. How did (or will) you use the plan?

FOR PLANNING:

- ☐ layout
- ☐ manure disposal
- ☐ sanitation
- ☐ management
- ☐ ventilation
- ☐ building arrangement
- ☐ building materials
- ☐ for or with a client
- ☐ other — please name _____

FOR CONSTRUCTION:

- ☐ complete building
- ☐ part of building
- ☐ equipment — please name _____
- ☐ trusses
- ☐ floor
- ☐ ventilation system
- ☐ other — please name _____

FOR REMODELING:

- ☐ floors
- ☐ ventilation system
- ☐ manure disposal system
- ☐ feeding system
- ☐ other — please name _____

8. Please describe one or two of the projects checked in question 7.

PROJECT _____

When was it completed? _____

By whom? ☐ Yourself
☐ Contractor
☐ Other — please name _____

Effect of project on total business?

- ☐ much improvement
- ☐ little improvement
- ☐ no improvement
- ☐ other descriptions _____

PROJECT _____

When was it completed? _____

By whom? ☐ Yourself
☐ Contractor
☐ Other — please name _____

Effect of project on total business?

- ☐ much improvement
- ☐ little improvement
- ☐ no improvement
- ☐ other descriptions _____

9. Please rate the listed parts of the plan using one of the following numbers.

1 - very useful

2 - useful when modified

3 - needs to be expanded

4 - did not believe

5 - did not understand

6 - could not use

SECTION OF PLAN

YOUR RATING

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Floor plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wall section	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventilation explanation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventilation details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Management suggestions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manure disposal details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Door details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feeder or bunk details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Typical construction detail	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Materials cutting list	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Truss details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Equipment details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other — please list _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. What equipment plans, building plans, and informational topics would you suggest be included in some future publication?

EQUIPMENT PLANS

BUILDING PLANS

INFORMATIONAL TOPIC

11. Please make any additional comments, criticisms or suggestions.

Post Card Reminder

During January, 1967, the Midwest Plan Service sent out a questionnaire to all people who requested publications during 1965 and 1966. As you requested a publication, you were sent a questionnaire.

Most of the returned questionnaires contain many useful facts and opinions that we will be analyzing soon.

As of January 27, we had not received your returned questionnaire. Please inform us if you have not received your questionnaire.

If you have received it, please fill in as many answers as you can and return the questionnaire to us. Please help us make future publications match the needs and uses that you and other users have.

